



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1068OK-1 for Purcell Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Although the applicant provided a table outlining their work in the four core areas listed by the two districts in the consortium, the applicant did not clearly articulate in the narrative a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. The applicant did not articulate within the narrative provided a clear and credible approach in how it would achieve its goal of providing individualized services to students ages 3 through the 6th grade through accelerated student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through student support.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant recognized a gap in readiness by its entering class of students but did not provide evidence in its narrative of a strong approach to implementing a proposal that will support high-quality LEA-level and school level implementation of its proposal to address the needs of the students targeted through this project.</p> <p>Although the applicant identified the need for the grade bands it is targeting its efforts, the process the applicant used to select the schools that were selected to participate was provided but it was unclear which schools were selected based on the discussions held by its superintendents.</p> <p>The applicant did provide evidence of the schools that will participate in the project, and the total number of participating students broken down into the subcategories required, but the applicant did not provide the participating educators broken down into the required categories (e.g. principals and teachers) and instead it provided the number of educators that will be participating.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes the plan it will use to improve student learning but does not provide a sufficient description of its plan to meet the requirements of a comprehensive high-quality plan to scale up the reforms to support district-wide change.</p> <p>The applicant identified other school districts that it would share information with about their program, but did not address scaling the proposal into meaningful reform to support district-wide changes for the districts within the consortium that will help the applicant reach its outcome goals.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide details in its plan and vision that will likely result in improving learning performance.</p> <p>The applicant provides goals that are not ambitious or achievable for the targeted group of students from six months to sixth grade that will impact improved student learning and performance and increase equity. The data it provided was from its summative assessments, graduation rates and college enrollment.</p> <p>The applicant's narrative is unclear on how the applicant will tie its reform vision of targeting students from six months to sixth grade to goals that will result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity.</p>		

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	2
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence of advancing student learning and achievement because the applicant did not provide specific data for four years. Instead the applicant provided general statements in there narrative that achievements had been made in the past four years that were not backed by data.</p> <p>The applicant did not describe or provide evidence of the reforms it has made for its lowest performing schools.</p> <p>Although the applicant makes data available to educators, the applicant did not describe how the information provided would assist in improving instruction and services.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not provide sufficient evidence to indicate a high level of transparency regarding salaries and expenditures being accessible by the public. The applicant provided that the budgets are provided on the websites of the districts participating in the consortium. However, the applicant did not address whether the listed items of this criteria were available on the districts' websites.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes compliance with current state law and tools made available to it by the state, but the applicant does not demonstrate that it has sufficient autonomy under State statutory and regulatory requirements to implement personalized learning for its students.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	4
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided evidence of how it reached out to stakeholders in developing its application. However, the applicant provided a small number of support letters that did not include key stakeholders that the applicant described in its narrative as contacting and minimal efforts made by the applicant to reach out to key stakeholders including government officials. This lack of supporting evidence indicates that a meaningful engagement of key stakeholders did not occur. In addition, the applicant does not describe which sections of the application were revised from input received and whether its teachers are indeed supportive of the application since letters of supports from district teachers and administrators were not provided.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does identify needs and gaps for the student grades it has indicated it will server, but the applicant does not provide the evidence demonstrating that it has a high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status for implementing personalized learning environments.</p>		

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	6
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant identified the use of the ACT Explore assessment for its 5th graders as a means to determining areas that its</p>		

students need improvement to be college and career ready. However, the approach proposed by the applicant to engage and empower all learners, in particular high-need students is not a high-quality plan.

The applicant mentions and lists items that will be covered to assist its students with personalized learning but the applicant does not describe or provide evidence of how the students would be engaged to develop skills such as critical thinking, obtain an understanding of the skills needed to succeed in school, and obtaining the technological training needed when using new learning tools such as an i-pad.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4
---	----	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes the components for its professional improvement plan but has not provided sufficient evidence of a high-quality plan for improving teaching through professional development.

The applicant does not describe how the professional development provided will assist teachers and principals in working with the students in the grades identified in its application to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments to ensure students are college and career-ready, and includes professional development for teachers in grade levels outside the scope of those identified.

The applicant does not provide sufficient detail on how educators will have sufficient access to and know how to use tools, data, and resources to accelerate student learning, and the applicant does not provide sufficient detail on how educators have access to resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment.

Although the applicant identified the lack of math skills in several of its teachers, the applicant does not describe a high quality plan to address the professional development these teachers will be provided to make them highly effective teachers.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	3

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not provide evidence to indicate that there are practices, policies, and rules in place that will facilitate personalized learning. The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence describing how the central offices will provide supports and services to the participating schools and does not provide evidence to determine whether leadership teams will be provided the autonomy necessary to make their own decisions regarding schedules and personnel. In addition, the applicant did not describe how learning resources such as i pads will be accessible by all students, and more specifically by students with disabilities and English language learners.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of providing access of content, access to learning materials and technical support to low-income students. However, the applicant does not describe the effective means by which access to content and learning materials will be provided and what technological tools will be available to stakeholders.

The applicant does not describe the school infrastructure it has to ensure that stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support.

The applicant provides data to parents and educators through its Early Warning Indicator System but does not have a total inter-operative system.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not describe or provide evidence of a strong strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that would indicate how the applicant will improve the project. The applicant did not address how it would monitor, measure and publicly share information on the quality of its investment.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not effectively provide a strategy for ongoing communications with stakeholders. The applicant's strategy was to supplement communications already taking place within the districts such as providing information at a school board meeting or posting information on its websites.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: The performance measures selected by the applicant are ambitious yet achievable. However, the applicant did not describe or provide evidence on how it will improve the measures, and did not provide the rationale for selecting those measures.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides for the engagement of a third-party consultant to assist in evaluating the effectiveness of its project. However, the applicant does not provide sufficient detail in its narrative or in the chart provided on how the evaluation plan will be used to productively use time, staff, money or other resources in order to improve results.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provided several line items that were not described in more detail in the budget narrative regarding the need for or the reasoning for requesting the item such as the number of pre-kindergarten teachers, support staff and travel.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant lists sources of funding it may use to sustain the project but was vague in providing a budget beyond the first year to continue sustaining the project.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not submit this section in its application.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
--	-----------	-------

Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided a project that called for the personalized learning of students six months to 6th grade. However, throughout the application, the applicant did not tie together strategies mentioned and personalized tools back to the targeted group of students provided as part of its project and how the strategies would impact decreasing the achievement gap and increase graduation rates through services provided to the targeted group of students.</p>		

Total	210	59
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1068OK-2 for Purcell Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Noble and Purcell Public Schools four education assurance areas are: adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the work place to complete in the global community; building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction; recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and turning around lowest achieving schools. The application demonstrated a limited vision on how it will move and deepen student achievement. The applicant's plan was vague when addressing how the individualized tasks would be available to all, how this plan will help students achieve academics success and how this plan will close achievement gaps in their districts.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Purcell and Noble collaboration have support from the Oklahoma Department of Education, both districts' superintendents and key stakeholders. The districts decided to focus on 6 schools: 3 from Purcell District and 3 from the Noble School district. The applicants reform plan will align both districts' standards to ensure that students receive a better education. A chart breaks students into the necessary school demographics and gives the total of participating students in each demographic. It was not clear from the applicants plan how they would effectively serve subgroups participating. The applicant intends to serve students that are not eligible for the grant because the applicant proposed to serve students from birth.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicants assert that they have a plan but the applicant provides insufficient details to make it clear how the proposal will be translated into meaningful reform to support district wide change.</p>		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The tables provided show the baseline assessments and anticipated achievable annual goals on the state targets in each subgroup: White, Native American, Hispanic, IEP, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged. The narrative explains the table, which focuses on decreasing the achievement gap, and states that some data was not available from the State Department in time to be included in the grant application. The applicant states that the goals presented to decrease the achievement gap in most subgroups are achievable. They are ambitious but it is not clear that they are achievable. The narrative for graduation rates was hindered by the fact that the state does not collect demographic data for graduation. The narrative states that as part of the grant funding, graduation rates data for Noble and Purcell will be gathered and disaggregate. It is also not clear that the college enrollment and the Postsecondary degree attainment goals are achievable.</p>		

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Because the applicant did not provide four years of data, a clear track record of success is not evident in the charts and narrative provided in the application. The narrative states that the Noble and Purcell Districts worked diligently to overcome challenges and to move their middle schools from the School Improvement list on the state level. It does not state however if and how they were removed, where they did increase or how did they increase and overcome their weaknesses.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not provide a chart for school personnel salaries. However, the applicant did state in the narrative that audits are conducted annually and reviewed locally, statewide and federally. The applicant did not show a high level of transparency and did not met the criteria.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Purcell and Noble Public School districts provide evidence of successful autonomy under the state requirements to implement personalized learning environments.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A description of how students, families, teachers and principals are engaged in the development of this proposal is written in the narrative. The stakeholders attended presentations during district meetings, during PTA/PTO meetings, and were able to view details on the districts websites. There is sound support from the community and the Oklahoma SDE in the narrative along with local banks and other city governments in the Appendix.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The districts stated that they will focus on establishing a firm foundation for student's individualized learning. It is not clear how this will help them evaluate the current status of personalized learning environments. The narrative was insufficient in providing evidence to demonstrate how the learning environment would be personalized and how the needs and gaps would be addressed for their current participating students. The applicant does go into detail about the needs and gaps of the districts preschool age children but this does not the needs and gaps of the participating students.</p>		

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states clearly that many of its goals apply to preschool school age children. These children are not eligible as participating students as defined in this grant competition or as referenced in this criteria.</p> <p>The two districts provide a plan that is unclear and lacks comprehensive support for their current students. The applicant states the need for a paradigm shift to go from “one size fits all” to a more personalized learning approach but the “how” is still unclear. The adjustment of the paradigm for teachers from the traditional classroom to incorporating more technology and rigorous activities shows the ambition of the districts, but the lack of a clear implementation plan makes it unrealistic.</p> <p>The chart lays out some goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties. However, this is not a comprehensive plan and the lack of detail on how all of this will be carried out is a huge missing piece.</p> <p>The applicant does not address mechanisms that are in place to provide training and support to the students to ensure they know how to use the tools and resources to manage their learning.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative addresses teacher training through PDs, workshops, and college/university credit classes. However the applicant focuses on addressing its teachers struggles with math. Although, it is necessary for teachers to be competent in their core curriculum areas this is not sufficiently responsive to the selection criteria. The applicant is not addressing how it will support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments or adapt content and instruction in response to students’ academic needs and interest.</p> <p>The applicant also does not sufficiently address how participating educators will have access to tools data and resources to accelerate student progress.</p> <p>The narrative is missing some relevant points and parts of this section of the application and therefore this is not a high quality plan.</p> <p>Although the applicant reiterates the importance of increasing the math capacity among its math teachers, the applicant does not specifically present any plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from highly qualified teachers and principals.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	4
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Noble and Purcell districts formed a consortium for the Race to the Top competition. The narrative is inconsistent when referring to a “team” since it states that each district has its own leadership team. There is no evidence supporting the formation of one cohesive team that will provide joint leadership under this consortium; accordingly, it is unclear that any team has control over the flexibility and autonomy for these six schools.</p> <p>The district intends to shift student mastery so students will have the option to master objectives through online coursework or through proficiency-based promotion. The applicant indicates that the mixture of technology, a devised plan that will not allow students to forget, and the implementation of the Common Core are ways to give students multiple times and ways to demonstrate mastery. The plan is ambiguous and on how this will facilitate personalized learning for their students.</p> <p>The applicant does acknowledge that both districts will need to realign their instructional practices and learning resources to truly educate their students and empower their teachers. The narrative addresses the use of technology to enhance learning like the Ipad, or E-reader. The narrative fails to clearly address how using this technology will ensure personalized learning for students with disabilities, ELL students, and or “at-risk” students.</p>		

The vision is unclear and does not provide a thorough implementation of the practices and rules needed for a personalized learning plan for the district's students.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

4

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The school infrastructure in both districts will ensure that all participating students, teachers and other stakeholders will have access to necessary content, tools and resources. This will include being granted information about the Common Core Assessments, through electronic and paper based materials.

The districts will conduct technical support training using one-on-one settings, small and large group settings, and electronic delivery by district or external trainers. Everyone will work together to ensure that it lead to evidence of student learning.

The districts will continue using the WAVE system for administration and teachers, and parents will eventually have access to their child's school information through this system. Administrators and teachers use the WAVE as an early indicator system, how the system works or how it influences student learning is not evident.

By 2014 the WAVE should be operational so that all of a student's data will be available at this central location. It is not stated if the WAVE portal will allow access to export the data for use in other electronic learning systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
The plan in the narrative did not provide extensive evidence to show the strategies to implement a rigorous improvement plan. The narrative stated that the Malcolm Baldrige Performance Excellence Award criteria would be used to develop questions for improvement. The questions were not provided and the process of implementing this criterion to invest in the grant was not thoroughly explained.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
The narrative does state the formal and informal communication posted on the website, opening up for modifying communication and strategies with the staff members. The district's plans on how they will effectively communicate with stakeholders during this grant and post grant seem are still under construction and not cohesive.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
The performance measurements were not clearly stated and the vision was not achievable because there was no baseline or data available to compare the previous test scores to the predicted test scores. In the narrative it was stated that there was no state structured baseline testing guidelines to compare to and that they would be developed prior to year one of the grant. It was not stated who or how these statewide baseline structured test would be developed or used. The performance measures for some subgroups lacked evidence of thorough statistics. The criteria for college/career readiness lacked a complete picture of subgroup breakdown to show progress or lack thereof.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
The narrative stated the input process and output process, but the table and the narrative did not detail plans to evaluate the effectiveness of investments. The districts will call in experts to assist in the evaluation during the grant and at the close out of the grant to ensure operations run smoothly. Other experts will assist in measurement tools to assess the "whole child". The districts' did not address plans to use time, staff, or money more effectively.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The budget has several missing details and calculations that are not cohesive with the narrative presented prior to the budget. The proposed budget does not clearly provide rationale for investments and priorities. Several operational costs are not included throughout the four years to make the budget predicted achievable or sustainable throughout the grant years and post grant years.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has attempted a high-quality plan for sustainability of their project's goal after the term of the grant. Yet, the details are vague on how the plan will be carried out where the funding will come from and the plan is lacking structure.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: This section was not evident in the narrative.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The School districts of Noble and Purcell did not coherently and comprehensively address how it would build on core educational areas to create a learning environment that would improve teaching and learning. The plan, although ambitious, was unclear at times and without thorough details on several plans that were proposed. The partnership between the two districts lacked a true cohesiveness during the grant process and did not provide evidence of a collaboration to benefit the community, stakeholders, educators or students. The application did present desired results for students in the consortium, however, how the results and outcomes would be implemented and successful did not follow through from K to twelfth grade. There was little evidence of support for the students personalized learning in preparation for college/career ready assessments or classes. Although the applicant referenced the subgroups, the applicant did not address how personalized learning plans would close the achievement gap. There was no attempt to address the students who may be gifted or on track learners. There was a written explanation on how the community agencies would partner with the district to integrate their services but the social-emotional and behavior needs were not addressed. The plan was obscure on how this would assist participating students and their families in the reform and implementation stage of the Race to the Top competition.		

Total	210	74
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1068OK-3 for Purcell Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a modest reform vision for school readiness and elementary-age student achievement.</p> <p>The proposal describes its work in the four core educational assurance areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Past, current and planned activities are presented in each of the core areas. Both districts are in the process of shifting from PASS (Oklahoma Priority State Standards) to Common Core standards. Assessments will include those developed with the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers and Core Curriculum Tests in grades 3 through 8 by 2014-15. Data systems are in process. Progress is being made but there are more plans than there are useful tools at this point in time. With the transition to Common Core, adjustments will be made in assessments, testing, data gathering and analysis. Professional development is part of the plan to recruit and train teachers. Currently, no schools are on the School of Improvement list and the state is transitioning to a growth model to gauge school performance. 		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The implementation process for personalizing learning is not clearly stated, but it will build on each district's success in turning around failing schools. The narrative in this section rambles from the disparities in 3 year-olds' school readiness to exit criteria for high school graduation.</p> <p>Schools were selected through discussions about learning challenges, data review and input from community leaders and experienced educators. Six feeder schools were chosen and are listed with numbers of participating educators, participating students who are high-need, participating students from low-income families and the total number of students. 2,307 students will participate; 58.3% are from low-income families.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan does not describe how reforms would be scaled or translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change. The Logic Model does not include activities that would lead to short- or longer-term student outcomes. Other components such as changes in assessments or professional development are also not included on the Logic Model.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This is a weak plan with goals for student performance and achievement that are not associated with any described activities or interventions.</p>		

The applicant provides extensive summative assessment data for students by subgroup in grades 3 through high school. Annual target goals are set for students at all grade levels, although the planned activities do not extend past students in 6th grade. Baseline data was not available for subgroups to set a starting point to measure decreasing achievement gaps so all students in all subgroups were assigned 70 or a "C" as a baseline. All subgroups have exactly the same data for graduation rates.

B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a weak response to the subcriteria. Since the project is focused on birth-6th grade, at a minimum a four-year history of 3rd-6th grade assessment data would provide evidence of district/teacher success. No such evidence is included, although the applicant states data is analyzed at the start of each school year.</p> <p>Reforms focused on increasing literacy improved reading scores in four of the schools; a timeline indicating how long the reforms have been in place is not provided.</p> <p>Two schools are removed from the state's School of Improvement list this year; it is not revealed how long the schools were listed as low-performing or what was changed or how improvements were made.</p> <p>It is unclear how student performance data is made available to educators, students or parents and less clear how it is used.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The districts demonstrate a moderate level of transparency, complying to state rules. The district budget is linked on district websites; it is not clear if schools post or make available their own school-level budgets. A committee structure is in place for engaging the community in decisions concerning restricted funds; it is not clear how this works.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal does not include a discussion of state legal, statutory and regulatory requirements. However, the proposal does not seem to include any practices or innovations that would challenge existing requirements. Because the project is within current guidelines, there are successful conditions and the district has sufficient autonomy to implement the project.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is evidence of moderate levels of stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal. The applicant provides narrative statements that the proposal was shared with multiple stakeholders, including teachers who were asked directly for input. The application is signed by the union representative. Letters of support are included in the Appendix from two mayors, two bankers, and a state legislator. The proposal is lacking written evidence of support from community agencies and organizations that are critical to its success. Also missing are letters of support from the participating schools and from parents.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan is limited in scope, focusing on goals to support families with very young children and to develop a data system to track progress in the early childhood population. Data is lacking, the narrative states that some children are lacking alphabetic and phonemic awareness and that more children are exhibiting behavior issues. There is a concern that the competition is not designed for children not enrolled in public school (as defined).</p> <p>Descriptions of data gathered or available is inconsistent throughout the proposal. It is stated here that data has been</p>		

gathered to establish a baseline for measuring student and school progress and accomplishments. In other sections, it is stated that baseline data is not available.

C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	8
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This is an inadequate plan; it is more of a long rationale than an approach to implementation. Overall, it is confusing and fails to address instructional strategies. While there are several specific components (iPads for every student, HOPSports and the EXPLORE assessment for 5th graders) that may support learning and lead to college- and career-readiness, the plan is not cohesive nor is it centered around personalized learning environments.</p> <p>A stated priority is support and resources for 6 months-2 year olds, problematic since the children are not enrolled in public schools.</p> <p>While Common Core standards will guide instructional content, current data systems for assessments and modifications of individual learning plans are unreliable and in the early stages of development.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	5
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan for helping teachers fully implement personalized learning and teaching for all students is not sufficient to accomplish the intent of the RTTT-D competition. Critical elements are missing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there is no training or training funds for learning how to implement personalized learning environments • there is no training or training funds to learn strategies to adapt content and instruction for individual students • there is no training or training funds to learn how to use data to inform instruction and modify practice <p>Similarly, there is no system to apply actionable information to student needs and interests; new tools and resources are only mentioned in the acquisition of iPads; there is no discussion of matching student needs with resources (beyond iPads) and approaches.</p> <p>The districts have adopted TULSA for teacher evaluations and McREL's Balanced Leadership Framework for principal evaluations. The systems may include support and interventions, but these are not articulated in the plan.</p> <p>There is a strong plan for increasing the number of students receiving instruction from highly effective teachers in math by departmentalizing and by intensive training for math teachers.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	7
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide evidence of comprehensive policies and infrastructure to provide "here and now" support in response to the criteria that every student and educator have the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed. Nor does it state that policies are a barrier to personalized learning. The central office does have a leadership team in place, and school-based leadership teams are established in schools. No evidence is presented that indicated that policies, rules or practices are either facilitating or impeding personalized learning. Flexibility and autonomy are not discussed. Personalized learning environments are not the focus of this proposal.</p> <p>Stated in the narrative, students have the option to demonstrate mastery within online courses and through "proficiency-based promotion". This is not explained further.</p> <p>There seems to be an assumption or an expectation that adaptations and accessibility for all students will be achieved through the apps utilized by iPads. This is a very minimal level of accommodation for learning styles or preferences, disabilities or</p>		

other learning challenges.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: The plan is sufficient. The proposal supports access to content in and out of school by supporting community-based early learning initiatives, parent training, and providing iPads and print materials. The plan includes a mention of technical support, but primarily within a goal to design support strategies not yet developed. The districts have a long way to go before inter-operable data systems will be available to students and parents. The districts intend to build on the WAVE (the state's emerging data warehouse) in the coming years.		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	6
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant presents an incomplete plan for continuous improvement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the use of Baldrige criteria is excellent although baseline data is inadequate for performance measurement data systems are currently incapable of providing timely data for examination there is no plan for sharing investments in professional development and grant-specific staff with stakeholders 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The plan for ongoing communication is sound. It reflects the districts' understanding of their communities. Strategies center on supplementing existing meetings, digital communications, reports and community gatherings with project-related updates and information.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: Seventeen performance measures are presented. There is no plan for review of the effectiveness of the measure. If data collection and analysis development plans move forward, there is a reasonable chance the data will be used to inform teachers and parents of areas of concern and achievement. Performance measures include numbers of students with highly effective or effective teachers and principals (all are forecast to be highly effective by grant's end), reading and math measures in Pre-3rd grade, reading, math and EXPLORE measures in 4th, 5th and 6th grades plus a measure of physical fitness as measured by qualifying for the National Physical Fitness Award. Performance measures also include family participation in early childhood initiatives and measure of school readiness.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: The plan for evaluation is clear and sequential. It includes the development of a logic model with inputs, processes and outputs. It depends heavily on finding and hiring an expert evaluator with the skills and knowledge to design an evaluation plan for the entire project. Increased productivity, in terms of use of time, staff or resources, is not addressed.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	3

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The budget is consistent with the activities outlined in the project. Other funding to support the project is not included in the budget. One-time expenditures are accounted for in the Equipment line. No narrative is provided that addresses the rationale for investments or priorities.

There are severe miscalculations in the budget narrative.

Section	Budget Summary	Narrative	Difference
1	2,620,000	2,129,000	491,000
2	704,400	635,600	68,800
3	240,000	240,000	0
4	2,803,850	2,387,850	416,000
5	644,730	1,273,050	-628,320
6	843,000	730,000	113,000
7	208,000	428,000	-220,000
8	224,000	216,000	8,000
	8,287,980	8,039,500	248,480

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)

10

3

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The sustainability plan is vague with references to redirecting district budgeting priorities, seeking reimbursement from the state for personnel and soliciting funding from foundations, local businesses and additional grants. Some internal capacity will be sustained past the grant term, such as teacher knowledge of math pedagogy, data management and 1:1 technology use.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The Competitive Preference Priority was not addressed.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The plan meets the Absolute Priority 1 but to a minimal extent. Personalization of learning environments is addressed, although not substantially. Standards and assessments and alignment with college- and career-readiness is addressed by extending the EXPLORE assessment to the elementary level. Professional development and increasing the effectiveness of educators is addressed, although limited in scope.

Total	210	80
-------	-----	----